

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 29, 2006 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shannon (U.S. Patent 6,233,618) in view of Pistoia (Pistoia, Marco, “Web Caching and Filtering with IBM WebSphere Performance Pack”, 3/1999, pp. 1-28, obtained from <http://www.redbooks.ibm.com/redpapers/pdfs/redp0009.pdf>). Pistoia discloses a generic rating system for internet content. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.),

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.¹

First, contrary to the Examiner's contention, Shannon does not teach the “step of further analyzing the content of the information” stored at new locations, as recited in each independent claim. In particular the passage from line 49 of column 14 to line 6 of column 10 merely discloses a “web walker” which seems to indiscriminately retrieve information from the web.

¹ M.P.E.P § 2143.

The Examiner also asserts in relation to Pistoia (see third paragraph on page 4 of the detailed action) that location indicators found to have restricted content are “periodically forward[ed] from the remote network node (which undertakes ‘further analysis’) to the subscriber networks for inclusion in the database of restricted location indicators, making particular reference to pages 16-18 containing a drawing (Figure 5 on page 17) entitled *PICS Filtering at the Proxy Server Level*.

However, the applicants respectfully submit that careful consideration of the referenced section does not disclose this sequence of events at all. Instead, Pistoia teaches the use of a ratings or labelling standard for web information and uses the Platform for Internet Content Selection (PICS) as an example of how such a labelling system might be deployed at the proxy server level. This PICS deployment allows the level of content provided to particular clients to be set at the proxy level by network administrators. In order to decide whether a particular document will be passed to a client or blocked (with reference to Figure 5), the proxy filter uses values contained in PICS labels supplied by a “label bureau” server which is in turn managed by a “rating service” which employs a “rating tool”.

It is clear, from the description of Figure 5 by Pistoia bridging pp 17 and 18, that the PICS labels are stored at the label bureau server rather than in a database of restricted network indicators maintained at each subscriber network, rather only previously passed pages of content are held in a proxy cache (see third paragraph on page 18). Furthermore, if a request is made for content from a site that has not been rated by the rating service, the proxy is advised accordingly and the user “profile” determines whether the content is forwarded to the user or blocked. Pistoia teaches that “[s]ome label bureau servers in the future will fetch the content and run a program to

create an interim rating that will be returned [presumably to the proxy] pending the reviewer's [or ratings tools'] more accurate site evaluation.

Another way for supplying ratings labels to the caching and filtering proxy server taught by Pistoia is that the labels may be supplied by the Web server. In this other way (elaborated on in the fifth paragraph on page 18) the deployment "is simplified if the Web server is enabled to embed PICS labels in the Web documents it serves . . . , and the proxy server is configured to accept such labels without the need to contact an external label bureau". This essentially leaves the issue of ratings in the hands of the content supplier.

Thus Pistoia teaches two alternative methods for controlling access to documents, the first using an external label bureau/rating service and the second using labels supplied by the Web server according to some predetermined standard.

While the applicant concedes that Pistoia also mentions (in the fourth paragraph on page 17) the use of the proxy's hard disc storage for PICS labels, Pistoia does not teach, suggest or even imply any client network side ("initial") analysis of web content, nor that the database be updated by "periodically forwarding the location indicators found to have restricted content from the remote network node (such as a label bureau/rating service) to the subscriber networks for inclusion in the database of restricted network indicators", and in particular subsequent to the step of further analyzing the digital information not dealt with in a time limit imposed on the client side analysis, as presently claimed.

In summary, Shannon does not teach or suggest all of the steps ascribed by the Examiner and, further, the two stage (timed initial followed, as required by further analysis) collaborative filtering function disclosed at all by the combination of Shannon with Pistoia. In Pistoia, only the label bureau is updated and proxy servers only obtain the applicable rating when a further request for the content is made to the service. Put simply, neither Pistoia nor Shannon – whether alone or in combination – disclose that the findings of the few can benefit the many, provided the databases at subscriber networks are periodically updated to thereby overcome delays with on-demand access to a central or bureau ratings database.

The Second 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 7, 17 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shannon (U.S. Patent 6,233,618) in view of Pistoia, further in view of Maurer (Maurer et al., “Hash Table Methods,” 1975, pp. 5-19, obtained from <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=356645&coll=GUIDE&dl=GUIDE&CFID=52013892&CFTOKEN=24807428&ret=1#Fulltext>).

The rejections relying on the asserted combination of Shannon with Pistoia together with Maurer and/or Willens, are similarly overcome for the reasons set out above, since the rejected claims are appended to the distinguished independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP



Dated: September 27 2006

David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040